Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 18 1982
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

No. 81-1843

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1981

THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,

Petitioner,

vs.

JOHN ANDREAS,

Respondent.

On Writ Of Certiorari To The Appellate Court
Of Illinois, First Judicial District

JOINT APPENDIX

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FILED APRIL 3, 1982
CERTIORARI GRANTED OCTOBER 12, 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chronological List of Relevant Docket Entries	1
Information, filed April 16, 1979	2
Respondent's Motion to Suppress Evidence, filed March 6, 1980	4
Respondent's Motion to Quash Arrest and Suppress Evidence, filed March 6, 1980	6
Report of Proceedings had on the hearing on respondent's Motion to Suppress Evidence, May 22, 1980	8
Ruling of court granting respondent's Motion to Suppress Evidence, issued June 3, 1980	16
Notice of Appeal, filed July 3, 1980	19
Memorandum of Orders (Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois)	21

The Opinion of the Illinois Appellate court is reported at 100 Ill. App. 3d 396, 426 N.E.2d 1078 (1st Dist. 1981) and is included in the petition for *certiorari* as Appendix A, at 1a through 12a.

The Circuit Court's ruling appears in the petition for *certiorari* as Appendix B, at 1b through 2b.

The order of the Illinois Supreme Court of February 2, 1982, denying petitioner's petition for leave to appeal appears in the petition for *certiorari* as Appendix C, at 1c.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1981

THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,

Petitioner,

vs.

JOHN ANDREAS,

Respondent.

On Writ Of Certiorari To The Appellate Court Of Illinois, First Judicial District

JOINT APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF RELEVANT DOCKET ENTRIES

April 16, 1979—
Information filed in the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois.

March 6, 1980—
Respondent's Motion to Suppress Evidence filed.

March 6, 1980—
Respondent's Motion to Quash Arrest and Suppress Evidence filed.

June 3, 1980—
Order of the Honorable Mark E. Jones granting respondent's Motion to Suppress Evidence.

July 3, 1980—
Notice of Appeal filed.

September 15, 1981—
Opinion of the Appellate Court of Illinois, First Judicial District.

February 2, 1982—
Petitioner's petition for leave to appeal denied by the Illinois Supreme Court.

[74]

STATE OF ILLINOIS
COUNTY OF COOK—SS.

THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
v.
JOHN ANDREAS

Info. No. 79 2245

INFORMATION

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS represented by the State's Attorney of Cook County, do hereby inform and charge that against the peace and dignity of the People of the State of Illinois and in violation of the laws of the State of Illinois the herein named defendant(s) contrary to the 1977 Illinois Revised Statutes as amended did violate said laws of Illinois as described herein.

[75]

(Count No. 1)

The State's Attorney of Cook County now appears before the Circuit Court of Cook County and in the name and by the authority of the People of the State of Illinois states that on February 22nd, 1979 in Cook County, Illinois John Andreas committed the offense of Possession of Cannabis in that he, knowingly and unlawfully possessed and had under his control, otherwise than as authorized in the Cannabis Control Act of said State of Illinois then in force and effect, a quantity more than five hundred grams of cannabis sativa, sometimes called marijuana, In violation of Chapter 56½ Section 704(e) Illinois Revised Statutes and against the peace and dignity of the People of the State of Illinois.

[76]

(Count No. 2)

The State's Attorney of Cook County now appears before the Circuit Court of Cook County and in the name and by the authority of the People of the State of Illinois states that on February 22nd, 1979 in Cook County, Illinois John Andreas committed the offense of possession of Cannabis with intent to deliver in that he, knowingly and unlawfully possessed with intent to deliver otherwise than as authorized in the Cannabis Control Act of said State of Illinois then in force and effect a quantity more than five hundred grams of cannabis sativa sometimes called marijuana, In violation of Chapter 56½ Section 705(e) Illinois Revised Statutes and against the peace and dignity of the People of the State of Illinois.

[77]

STATE OF ILLINOIS

COUNTY OF COOK—SS.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS by the State's Attorney of Cook County, through his Assistant State's Attorney, after first being duly sworn on his oath, deposes and swears that the foregoing 2 count(s) in this information has/have been read and subscribed by him as evidenced by his signature below and that the same in each count hereby incorporated is true.

/s/ Signature Illegible
Assistant State's Attorney

Subscribed and sworn to before me April 16th, 1979.

/s/ VIRGINIA L. GLASS
Judge, Clerk, or Notary

The bail is fixed at _____

JUDGE: _____
Enter

[91]

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT—CRIMINAL DIVISION

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	No. 79-2245
JOHN ANDREAS,	)	
Defendant.	)	

MOTION TO SUPPRESS EVIDENCE

(Filed March 6, 1980)

Defendant, JOHN ANDREAS, through his attorneys, Patrick G. Reardon, and Lawrence J. Suffredin, Jr., moves this Court to suppress evidence seized by law enforcement officers in violation of defendant's rights. In support of his motion defendant states as follows:

1. Defendant was arrested at 61 E. Goethe, Chicago, Illinois, on February 22, 1979.

2. At the time of the said arrest, law enforcement officers seized a closed steel shipping container which was sealed at the time of the seizure.

3. The said sealed container was taken by law enforcement officers to the Chicago Police Station at 1121 S. State, Chicago, Illinois.

4. The said container was seized without a warrant.

5. After seizing and transporting the sealed metal container to the police station, law enforcement agents opened the container and seized the contents.

6. The opening of the container and the seizure of its contents was done without a warrant.

[92]

7. One of the contents alleged to have been seized from within the container was a circular table of solid wood approximately three to three and a half feet in diameter with a thickness of seven to eight inches with a heavy cover of lacquer on it.

8. After seizing the table from within the container police agents destroyed the said table by opening it up and allegedly seizing from inside it a quantity of marijuana.

9. The opening and damaging said table and the seizure of the alleged contents was done without a warrant.

10. The prosecution has indicated to the defendant that it plans to use the package and the contents of the said table as evidence against him at trial.

11. The seizure of the container, the opening, damaging, and seizure of its contents was a violation of defendants rights under the United States Constitution, Amendment IV, and the Illinois Constitution, Article I, Section 6.

WHEREFORE, defendant, JOHN ANDREAS, moves this Court to enter an order prohibiting the prosecution from introducing the sealed container or any of its contents as evidence at trial or making any reference thereto at trial in the above captioned case.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ PATRICK G. REARDON
PATRICK G. REARDON
LAWRENCE J. SUFFREDIN, JR.
Attorneys for John Andreas
221 North LaSalle Street, -1938
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 372-5716

[94]

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT—CRIMINAL DIVISION

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	No. 79-2245
JOHN ANDREAS, Defendant.	)	

MOTION TO QUASH ARREST AND SUPPRESS EVIDENCE

(Filed March 6, 1980)

Defendant, JOHN ANDREAS, through his attorneys, Patrick G. Reardon, and Lawrence J. Suffredin, Jr., moves this Court to quash his arrest and suppress all evidence seized as a result of that arrest. In support of his motion he states as follows:

1. Defendant was arrested at 61 E. Goethe, Chicago, Illinois, on February 22, 1979, at approximately 5:30 P.M.

2. At the time of his arrest defendant was shown no warrant for his arrest or for the search of his person or the premises.

3. At the time of his arrest defendant was doing no act which would give rise to a conclusion of probable cause that he was committing or had committed an offense.

4. At the time of his arrest, certain items were seized by the arresting officers.

5. In particular, a sealed container alleged to contain a quantity of marijuana was among the items seized.

[95]

6. Defendant has been informed that the seized items will be used against him at trial in the above-captioned case.

7. The arrest and seizure described herein were in violation of defendant's rights under the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States and under the Constitution of the State of Illinois, Article I, Sections 1, 2, 6, and 10.

WHEREFORE, defendant, JOHN ANDREAS, moves this Court to enter an order quashing his illegal arrest and suppressing all evidence seized as a result thereof.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ PATRICK G. REARDON
PATRICK G. REARDON
LAWRENCE J. SUFFREDIN, JR.
Attorneys for John Andreas
221 North LaSalle Street
Suite 1938
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 372-5716

[1]

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE COOK JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

JOHN ANDRESS, Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	No. 79-I-2245
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, Respondent.	)	Charge: Possession of a Controlled Substance

MOTION TO SUPPRESS EVIDENCE

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS of the hearing before the Honorable MARK E. JONES, on the 22nd day of May, 1980.

APPEARANCES:

MR. LAWRENCE SUFFREDIN,
MR. PATRICK REARDON,
on behalf of the Petitioner.

HONORABLE BERNARD CAREY
State's Attorney of Cook County, by
MR. KEVIN SWEENEY,
Assistant State's Attorney,
on behalf of the Respondent.

[21]

* * *

Q. Now, at the time that you delivered a package to the Goethe address, were you in possession of a search warrant for that package?

[22]

A. No, sir.

Q. Were you in possession of an arrest warrant for John Andress?

A. No, sir.

Q. During the half hour to 45 minutes that you stayed in the hall, was Officer Lipsek with you that entire time?

A. I was not in the hallway for the entire 30 to 45 minutes.

Q. Where were you during that 30 to 45 minutes?

A. Do you want me to answer your first question first or answer your second question?

Q. Second question first. Where were you during that 30 to 45 minutes?

A. Part of the time I was in the hall and the rest of the time I was in the building.

Q. Were you on the same floor as the Andress apartment when you were in the building?

A. No, sir.

Q. So that you did not have the Andress apartment under personal surveillance during that 30 to 45 minutes yourself?

A. That's correct.

Q. Do you know what happened to Officer Lipsek after you delivered the package?

[23]

A. I know now, but I didn't know at that time.

Q. What if anything did Officer Lipsek do during that period of time?

A. He exited the building.

Q. And do you know where he was going when he exited the building?

A. At that time or now?

Q. Now, sir?
A. Yes. Yes, sir, I do.
Q. Where was he going?
A. He was going to get a state search warrant.
Q. At the time that Mr. Andress was arrested, were you or any of the officers in possession of either a state or a federal court search warrant for the package?
A. To the best of my knowledge, no, sir.
Q. Were you or any of the other officers in possession of either a state or federal search warrant for John Andress?
A. To the best of my knowledge, no, sir.
Q. Are you aware of any warrant for the search of the container ever being issued by a state or federal judge on February 22, 1979?
A. I'm aware that none was issued.

[24]

MR. SUFFREDIN: Just a moment, your Honor.
(Brief pause.)
MR. SUFFREDIN: No further questions, your Honor. Thank you.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. SWEENEY:

Q. Sir, you testified that on the 22nd of February, 1979, you were given some information concerning a certain container in the possession of United States Customs Service, is that correct?
A. In reviewing Defendant's Exhibit Number 1 which is a carbon copy of special agent Thomas Thompson's report, I testified to receiving the information on February 22nd, but his report indicates that we in fact received the information on February 21st.
Q. Okay. Now where did you personally—from whom did you personally receive that information?
A. I was in a telephone conversation with either Inspector Thomas McDonald or John Micklecki of the U.S. Customs Agency.
Q. And what did they advise you, if anything, concerning this container?
A. That they had removed a table from a container that had been shipped from India. And upon removal of the

[25]

table and drilling of same, that they had removed a black substance which received a positive reaction—after field testing, a positive reaction for the presence of marijuana.

Q. I see. Now subsequently, did you proceed to inspect that container yourself?

A. No, sir.

Q. Well, you had occasion to see it the following day, is that correct?

A. To see the container, yes, sir, I did.

Q. Where was it when you first saw it?

A. It was in the custody of the U.S. Customs Agency.

Q. Where is that physically?

A. In their warehouse where I had first observed it the previous day.

Q. I see. Did you have occasion to perform any test yourself with respect to the container and its contents?

A. On the 21st of February, 1979, yes, sir, I did.

Q. Could you describe what test you performed and on what?

A. It was a marquis test in which—it's a plastic capsule; contains chemicals. I removed the top, placed some of the black substance inside; put the top of the

[26]

capsule back on. I pinched it breaking a container, a little tubular container inside, which released the chemicals. I shook it and after approximately 30 seconds, it changed to a certain color.

If it changes to that certain color, then that is an indication of a positive reaction for the presence of marijuana.

Q. Now, could you describe the container as you observed it when you first inspected it?

A. When I first observed it?

Q. When you first observed it?

A. Yes, sir, it was a metal container, I believe it was aluminum, approximately four foot square; approximately ten inches in depth. The top of it had been removed and a table that—I was advised that the U.S. Customs Inspectors had removed this table from that container.

Q. Did you have occasion to see the table at that time?
A. Yes, sir, I did.
Q. Could you describe the table?
A. It was a round table, dark in color, a dark reddish or a brownish wood. It was approximately seven inches in thickness. It had a heavy coating of lacquer all over the top of it and it gave off just a very deep shine.

[27]

Q. I see. Now, you had occasion to see that container again on February 22nd, is that correct?
A. Yes, sir, I did.
Q. And had it been resealed at that time?
A. At the time I observed it, it was resealed, yes, sir.
Q. Now, you testified that you took that container to an address on what, is it 61 East Goethe? Is that correct?
A. East Goethe, Chicago, Illinois.
Q. At that time you testified that you and Investigator Lipsek posed as delivery men and delivered it to John Andress, is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you observed—and you further testified that you observed the defendant take it in the apartment, is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, did you have any conversations with John Andress or did any conversations with John Andress take place in your presence at the time you delivered it?
A. Yes, sir.
MR. REARDON: Objection, Judge, irrelevant.

[28]

MR. SWEENEY: Your Honor, counsel is contending or is apparently contending there was no probable cause to arrest John Andress. Therefore what John Andress said at the time it was delivered is relevant.
THE COURT: Objection is overruled, you may answer. What was the answer?
MR. SWEENEY: The answer was yes.
THE COURT: What was the question?
MR. SWEENEY: The question was whether this officer engaged in any conversation with John Andress or was

present in any such conversation at the time the package was delivered.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SWEENEY: Q. Okay. And who was present in the course of that conversation or conversations?

A. I and John Andress was present during part of the conversation and Officer Lipsek, myself and John Andress was present during other parts of the conversation.

Q. I see. And where did this conversation take place?

A. The first part of the conversation took place in the lobby of the apartment building between myself and Mr. Andress.

Q. And where did the second part take place?

[29]

A. It took place outside the apartment building between the apartment building, the van, and back inside the apartment building.

Q. Okay. Would you relate to the Court who said what to whom during the first part of the conversation?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please do.

A. When I first entered the apartment building I was met—I met a security lady behind a wall and advised her that I was a delivery man and I had a package for Mr. Andress. Minutes later a subject appeared in the lobby of the apartment building at which time I asked him if he was in fact Mr. John Andress which he stated that he was.

Q. And was that the same Mr. John Andress who is present in court today?

A. He is the same Mr. Andress that is sitting at the end of counsel table with the glasses on. Okay. And he has a tan and yellow shirt and, I guess, an off-reddish jacket. He is on the right-hand side of counsel.

Q. Identifying the defendant for the record.

And did you have a conversation with Mr. Andress at that time?

A. Pardon me?

[30]

Q. And did you have a conversation with Mr. Andress at that time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what did you say to him and what did he say to you?

A. I stated that I was a delivery man and that I had a package for him. At that time he stated, "Good. Where is it?"

I told him it was out in the van and he stated that he'd help me carry it in. I told him that I had another delivery man with me outside and that we would be glad to bring the package wherever he would like it delivered.

Q. I see. And what happened then?

A. We walked outside the apartment building; met Officer Lipsek at which time we walked to the van. We opened up the rear doors; began to remove the container at which time Officer Lipsek stated that it was very heavy.

Mr. Andress stated that it wasn't that heavy, that he had packaged it himself, that it only contained a table. And we then removed the—well, simultaneously we were removing the package from the van.

We then carried it into the apartment building, put it on the elevator and went up to the second floor.

[31]

Q. Okay. Did any further conversation take place on the second floor?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what was said at that point?

A. Mr. Andress advised us to carry it down to his apartment and to lay it in the hallway right outside his apartment door.

Q. I see. And you testified that later you observed Mr. Andress carry or pull that package into his apartment?

A. I observed Mr. Andress pull it into his apartment.

Q. I see. Now later you testified that you were present at the arrest of Mr. Andress some half hour to 45 minutes later approximately, is that correct?

A. Approximately, yes, sir.

Q. And could you describe—was that the next time you saw Mr. Andress after you saw him pulling the package into his apartment?

A. No, sir.

Q. I see. When had you seen him between the time he had pulled the package into his apartment and the time he was placed under arrest?

A. Approximately five minutes after he pulled this package into the apartment I was conducting surveillance of the hallway in which his apartment door opened. I observed

[32]

Mr. Andress to exit his apartment door and then walk to a—I believe it was either a doorway or a window that was at the end of the hallway which was closest to his apartment door. I observed him to look outside; looked in both directions and looked downward and then turned around and re-entered his apartment.

Q. I see. Now when—could you describe where you observed him; what he was doing the next time you had occasion to see Mr. Andress?

A. He was in the hallway with the container outside of the hall.

Q. And what if anything was he doing with the container?

A. When I observed him, he wasn't doing anything with the container.

Q. I see. And at that time was he placed under arrest?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I see. Now was that container that he had with him at the time he was placed under arrest the same container you delivered to him earlier?

A. Yes, sir, it was.

Q. Okay. I have no further questions at this time.

* * *

[58]

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF COOK)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
COUNTY DEPARTMENT—CRIMINAL DIVISION

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS	)	
V	)	Information No. 79-2245
JOHN ANDRESS	)	

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had in the above entitled cause, before the Honorable MARK E. JONES, Judge of the Criminal Division, on the 3rd day of June, A.D., 1980.

APPEARANCES:

HON. BERNARD CAREY,
State's Attorney of Cook County, by
MR. DAVID J. WEINER,
Assistant State's Attorney,
appeared for the People;

MR. PATRICK REARDON and
MR. LAWRENCE SUFFREDIN,
appeared for the Defendant.

[60]

* * *

MR. SUFFREDIN: As Your Honor is well aware, we heard testimony on this case approximately two weeks

ago, and at that time we began arguments on the motion and the State requested an opportunity to file written briefs. We set a briefing schedule in which briefs were to be filed with the Court approximately five days later.

At that time we filed our brief and the State filed no brief. We then had further argument on that date, and the State was unable to distinguish any of the cases we had given them in the written brief, and the State asked for additional time to see if they could find cases to distinguish those. And that's why we set this specifically for one thirty in the afternoon on this date, to be able to do that.

MR. WEINER: Judge, the bailiff just advised me there is a call for me right now. That may be—

[61]

THE COURT: All right. Go take the call.

(Pause)

MR. WEINER: It was, indeed, my office calling me, my associate, Mr. Sikes, concerning my inquiry about this particular case, and it is his impression that Mr. Sweeney was under the belief that all arguments had been made in this matter and that Your Honor was to rule on it, and that is the purpose for us being here.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WEINER: That is the only representation that I can make to the Court, and that is the only representation I intend to make to the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Then the record will, of course, disclose that arguments have been made about a week ago, and I think on the basis of the two cases that you have had—What were the cases?

MR. REARDON: Chadwick and Arkansas versus Sanders.

THE COURT: All right. Determining of the facts, determining the situation in this case. All right. So that's Motion Defendant to Suppress—What was it to suppress? The search?

MR. WEINER: No.

MR. REARDON: The article seized.

[62]

MR. WEINER: There was somewhat—I am somewhat familiar with the case. There was, I—I think the argument that was being forwarded was not the search, because I think it was already conceded that the initial search that was made by the Customs People was lawful, but that the subsequent seizure was unlawful. Am I correct on that?

MR. REARDON: For purposes of this motion you are correct, that we have not argued the initial search, but we are arguing that the articles seized as a result—

THE COURT: Is that a Motion to Suppress Evidence?

MR. REARDON: Yes.

THE COURT: Motion to Suppress Evidence is sustained. All right. Now what?

* * *

[98]

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF COOK)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
COUNTY DEPARTMENT—CRIMINAL DIVISION

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS Plaintiff-Appellant	Indictment No. 79 I 2245
VS	
JOHN ANDREAS Defendant-Appellee	Honorable MARK JONES Trial Judge

NOTICE OF APPEAL

(Filed July 3, 1980)

An appeal is taken from the order or judgment described below:

1. Court to which appeal is taken: Appellate Court of Illinois—1st Dist.

2. Name of Appellee's Attorney and address to which notices shall be sent:

Name: Patrick G. Reardon

Address: 221 N. LaSalle St., Rm. 1938, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

If Appellant is indigent and has no attorney; does he want one appointed? _____.

3. Name and address of Appellant's Attorney on Appeal:

Name: State's Attorney of Cook County

Address: 574 Daley Center, Chicago, Ill. 60602

Phone: 443-5496

4. Date of Judgment or Order: June 3, 1980

5. Appeal is taken from: Order of Court surppressing evidence.

/s/ KEVIN SWEENEY
Assistant State's Attorney

Notice filed
Dated: July 3, 1980
Appeal Check Date _____

MEMORANDUM OF ORDERS
(Circuit Court Of Cook County, Illinois)

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

CASE NO.

v.

John Contreras et al

MEMORANDUM OF ORDERS

79 C 2245

DATE	JUDGE	ORDERS ENTERED	DATE	JUDGE	ORDERS ENTERED
2-27	Lynch J.D.	atty Abraham files appr	7-2-79	Jones	PP Mot 7-19 V
			9-7-79	Jones	PP Mot 10-9-79 nd
		DEFENDANT KNIGHT, WAIVES [illegible] OF JUDICIAL	NO		
		[illegible] COURT [illegible]	10-9-79	Jones	PP Mot 11-7-79
		[illegible] 10-5-79	11-7-79	Jones	PP Mot 11-26-79 V Def appr w.p.
		[illegible]			
	16	Special Felony Clerk's Office Rm 606	12-79	Jones	PP Mot 12-27-79 " " "
		for visit of Judges to Judge			
		Daniel J. Kubasiak Judge Dec.	12-11-79	Jones	PP MD 1-28-80
FEB 17 1979		PT State Pet Conv to Class			
		Cls Present - Written Petition Defendant for substitution of judge; Hon. Judge D. White [illegible] J. Hirsch, and [illegible] Jr. It is ordered by this Court, cause transferred to Chief Justice for re-assignment. See Written Petition in file.	3-6-80	Jones	PP MD Motion Conv to Class. ord. for MD Motion Mot p. Add. Conv ord. for MD Motion to Suppress granted ord. for MD Motion to allow impeachment ord. for MD Motion to Quash Arrest & Suppress evidence ord. for PP Mot 4-18 Nd
MAR 17 1980		ORDER OF COURT CAUSE ASSIGNED TO JUDGE [illegible] FOR June 11, 1980			
5-11-80	Jones	PP MD Motion order ord for Attorney Bar 7-2-79 V	5-22-80	Jones	PP MD Motion to Suppress Conv to Class ord for Mot 8-20-80 nd
6-5					

ORDERS

DATE	JUDGE	ORDERS ENTERED
5 29 80	JWW	P.T. MJG - 3 pp (Mail to Counsel)
6 3 80	JWW	P/M/D, Motion to suppress evidence by Govt. Ruling of Court Motion to Suppress evidence MJG 6-18-80
6 11 80	JWW	PP MJG 7-11-80
7 11 80	JWW	PP Ole appeal checklist 8-1-80
		DATE 7-3-80 NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED
		DATE 7-25-80 NOTICE OF NOTICE MAILED
10-22-1980	Clerk	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RECEIVED AND FILED IN CLERK'S OFFICE 1-Vol Motion to Suppress Evidence before the Honorable Mark E. Jones on May 29 1980
10-22-1980	Clerk	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RECEIVED AND FILED IN CLERK'S OFFICE 1-Vol. Before the Honorable Mark E. Jones on May 29, 1980
10-22-1980	Clerk	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RECEIVED AND FILED IN CLERK'S OFFICE 1-Vol. Before the Honorable Mark E. Jones on the Third Day of June 1980

MEMORANDUM OF ORDERS
(Circuit Court Of Cook County, Illinois)

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

v.

John Whitten

77 2345

MEMORANDUM OF ORDERS

DATE	JUDGE	ORDERS ENTERED	DATE	JUDGE	ORDERS ENTERED
4-5-11	Linn	Def. by Bob Reynolds & Atty			
		Record.			
			6 chs		